

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Planning Grant, Round 1, FY 2010-2011

Applicant	Upper Kings Basin IRWM Authority	County	Fresno, Tulare, Kings
Project Title	Upper Kings Basin IRWM Authority – IRWMP Update	Grant Request	\$236,890
		Total Project Cost	\$336,850

Project Description The Upper Kings Basin Integrated Water Management Authority (Authority), formerly called the Upper Kings Basin Water Forum, proposes to update their Integrated Regional Water Management Plan (IRWMP), which was originally drafted in 2007. The IRWMP will be updated to satisfy all of the new Plan Standards for IRWMPs, address inadequacies in the existing plan, and improve the overall regional planning process.

Evaluation Summary

Scoring Criterion	Score
Work Plan	12
DAC Involvement	10
Schedule	8
Budget	8
Program Preferences	8
Geographic Balance	0
Total Score	46

- **Work Plan** The work plan is adequate but supporting documentation and explanation would have increased the score. The application simply referred the reader to the current IRWMP. With the requirement that this should be a standalone document, the correlation was not made between what currently exists in the IRWMP which satisfies current IRWMP requirements. Table B included some tasks that need more explanation and detail as Table B items were included in the budget and schedule. The work plan does present a model for the IRWMP that will comply with the standards.
- **DAC Involvement** The application shows the process Upper Kings will use to facilitate and support DACs within the region. Based on the application Upper Kings collaborated and will collaborate with DACs in development of the IRWMP. The updated plan will include an expanded and more focused approach on engaging DACs. Four goals, recruit more DACs, encourage DACs to participate in planning process, assist in identifying DAC projects, and implement a sustainable program for DAC involvement, are identified within the application. These goals will be met through the pilot projects, DAC meetings, DAC work groups, and the Community Affairs Plan.
- **Schedule** The schedule addresses the criterion and is supported by thorough documentation and logical rationale. However, it is not clear how the DAC pilot project mentioned in the work plan fits into this schedule so reasonableness of the schedule could not be determined. The schedule corresponds with the work plan.
- **Budget** The budget fully addressed the criterion but is not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale. The majority of the budget items agree with the work plan and schedule with the exception of the task breakdowns. The main budget tasks are broken down further into subtasks than the work plan. Although there are no budgets for each of the plan's four main tasks (Attachment 3) in their respective discussions within the plan itself, there is a detailed summary budget (Attachment 4) for each main task and subtasks.
- **Program Preference** Eight program preferences (Include regional projects/programs, Effectively resolve conflicts, Address critical water supply/water quality of DACs, Effectively integrate water management and land use management, Drought preparedness, Use and reuse water more efficiently, Climate Change, Ensure Equitable Distribution of Benefits) are adequately addressed.
- **Geographic Balance** Not Applicable